

## REMARKS

Claims 11, 13-22, 24-28, 31-32, 34-45, 47-50, 52-61, and 63-65 are pending as of entry of this amendment. Claims 15 and 44 are amended to correct inadvertent errors in the dependencies of the claims. Claims 1-10, 12, 23, 29-30, 33, 46, 51, and 62 are withdrawn in response to the restriction requirement.

Applicants note that the Office Action Summary provided a 3-month shortened statutory period for reply to the restriction requirement.

### Restriction Under 35 U.S.C. §121

In the Office communication dated October 29, 2008, the Examiner restricted the claims to one of the following two groups:

- (1) Claims 1-10 and 15, drawn to a detection apparatus to detect magnetic fields, classified in class 600, subclass 409.
- (2) Claims 11-14, 16-65, drawn to an apparatus and method of detecting magnetic fields utilizing a magneto-optical element that exhibits a response in the form of Faraday motion, classified in class 600, subclass 409.

Before making an election, Applicants address the dependency of claim 15, which was included by the Examiner in the first grouping of claims. In the original filing, claim 15 was inadvertently (and erroneously) provided as a dependent claim of claim 7. By reviewing the language of claim 15 (e.g., the recitation of a "second magneto-optical element"), it is apparent that the claim was intended to depend from claim 11. Applicants have therefore corrected the dependency of claim 15 from claim 7 to claim 11. This amendment is supported by paragraph [0030] of the specification. In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the two groups of claims facing restriction are as follows:

- (1) Claims 1-10, drawn to a detection apparatus to detect magnetic fields, classified in class 600, subclass 409.
- (2) Claims 11-65, drawn to an apparatus and method of detecting magnetic fields utilizing a magneto-optical element that exhibits a

response in the form of Faraday motion, classified in class 600, subclass 409.

Applicants elect without traverse the claims of group 2, claims 11-65, for examination. Accordingly, the claims of group 1, claims 1-10, are withdrawn.

The Examiner further restricted the claims to the following groups of patentably distinct species:

- (a) Claims 5, 6 and 8, dependent from claim 1, directed to different configurations of the detection apparatus.
- (b) Claims 23 and 24, dependent from claim 11, directed to different compositions of the YIG film.
- (c) Claims 12 and 26, dependent from claim 11, directed to different configurations of the modulation element.
- (d) Claims 29, 30, 33, and 34, dependent from claim 11, directed to different detection targets and characterizations.
- (e) Claims 46 and 47, dependent from claim 40, regarding the shielding of the source of the magnetic field.
- (f) Claims 51 and 52, dependent from claim 40, directed to different compositions of the YIG film.
- (g) Claims 61 and 62, dependent from claim 40, directed to the different characteristics of optimization. (The Office action identified claims 61 and 63, but given the language of the claims and the dependency of claim 63 on claim 61, it is clear that the Examiner meant claims 61 and 62.)

Applicants elect claims 24, 26, 34, 47, 52, and 61 without traverse for examination. Accordingly, claims 5, 6, 8, 12, 23, 29, 30, 33, 46, 51, and 62 are withdrawn.

**Summary**

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned agent for the Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 26, 2009

  
Mindy N. Ritter, Reg. No. 57,803  
Agent for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
PO BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, IL 60610  
(312) 321-4200